

**ANNEXURE C**

**GOVERNMENT AGENCY SUBMISSIONS**

**IN RESPONSE TO DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**

*Please note that there is variation between figure numbers used by government agencies and those in “Section Addressed” column due to inclusion of additional figures in EA document following completion of draft EA.*

<b><i>D of P</i></b>	<b><i>Issues</i></b>	<b><i>Section Addressed</i></b>	<b><i>Annexure Addressed</i></b>
	<p><b><i>Capital Investment Value</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application form notes \$100 million, draft EA notes \$200 million. Confirm which is correct. Department to re-advise fee costs for PA.</li> </ul>	Estimated Capital Investment Value - \$200 million	
	<p><b><i>Landowners Consent</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are all works, including pipelines on SS owned land? What about pipeline works near Paper Plant? If located on land owned by others – consent is required.</li> </ul>	The pipelines in part may cross land owned by parties other than by Shoalhaven Starches. The owners’ consents of the owners of such land will be obtained before determination of the application.	
	<p><b><i>Main EA Text – General</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3.0 – include table with detail of effluent ponds, i.e. Pond No. and storage volume and a figure showing layout;</li> <li>Figure 2 – see comments for Section 5.4 below, as well as the following general notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sheet 2 must be reproduced separately so it can be seen what it is displaying. Pipelines must be coloured differently, so water and gas pipelines can be distinguished from one another</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Table 2 in Section 3 provides these details.</p> <p><b>Figure 3 and 4</b> provides this information.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some text still difficult to read, particularly proposed works in DDG area – some text is written over top of other text, these should be clear and legible;</li> <li>○ Can the figure be supported by any photographs of what new equipment is likely to look like? This would make it much easier for the public to understand what is being constructed.</li> <li>○ Show access points more clearly, or in a different colour;</li> <li>○ The image would be better printed in a larger size and folded into the EA, as this is the primary figure showing the proposed works and it is difficult to read.</li> <li>• Section 4.4 No details of community consultation undertaken.</li> <li>• Section 5.0 - Project Description – include image of cogeneration plant – dimensions, housed within a building? What would it look like? How close is proposed co-generation plant to core riparian zone (CRZ)? Works should be excluded from the CRZ and 7(f3) Env Protection zone.</li> <li>• Section 5.4 - Summary of Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Table does not include all elements of the project.</li> <li>○ Starch plant – Is a gluten grinder also proposed for the starch plant?</li> <li>○ Ethanol plant – how many cooling towers are proposed?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Figure 3</b> is provided as an A1 sheet to be read more clearly.</p> <p>Photographs of proposed equipment have been included in Section 5.0.</p> <p>Access points have been outlined in colour on <b>Figure 3</b>.</p> <p><b>Figures 2, 3 and 4</b> have been printed at A1 size.</p> <p>Section 4.4 details community consultation program and issues raised.</p> <p>The location of the proposed co-generation plant in terms of the CRZ is detailed in Section 7.9 of the EA and its proximity to the 7(f3) zone is outlined in Section 6.5 of the EA.</p> <p>Table 3 has been expanded to include all elements of the project.</p> <p>Table 3 has been modified to include grinder in starch plant.</p> <p>Table 3 has been modified to detail the number of cooling towers in the ethanol plant.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stillage Recovery/DDGs Plant – include 10 decanters proposed, what is the no. of storage and feed tanks, height, volume? Also include plastic curtains to be installed on DDG loadout doors;</li>   <li>○ Packing Plant – contains silos, are they internal to building or external, height, volume? What is the length, location of rail siding? Include weighbridge.</li>   <li>○ No mention of upgrade of rail siding and provision of a loop on main site – this is mentioned in traffic report, but EA only mentions work on packing plant site. Also not shown on Fig 2;</li>   <li>○ Pipelines not included – are there underground pipes from Starch/Gluten Plant as well as pipes on overbridge to packing plant? What is the length of treated water pipeline from Paper Mill to Factory? What is the length of gas pipeline from ponds to factory? These need to be shown on a clear figure. Figure 2 has a tiny insert referring to Sheet 2 which is not provided – also the key contains two red colours, so it is not possible to distinguish between the two different pipelines;</li> </ul>	<p>Table 3 has been modified to include details concerning the number of decanters and storage and food tanks.</p> <p>Table 4 includes details concerning the curtains to be installed within the DDG Loadout.</p> <p>The height of the silos is shown in <b>Figure 5</b> and described in Section 5.9. The location of the silos within the building is also described in Section 5.9. Table 3 has been modified to provide details concerning the Packing Plant and the length of the rail siding and weighbridge. The location of the rail siding is shown on <b>Figure 3</b>.</p> <p>The rail turnout is shown on <b>Figure 4</b>.</p> <p>Table 3 has been modified to include details of the pipelines associated with the proposal and details the length of the pipelines. The location of the pipelines is shown on both <b>Figures 3 and 4</b>.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not included in table – 35MW gas fired cogeneration plant, 20MW gas fired boiler;</li>   <li>○ Environmental Farm/WWTP – physical structures of WWTP not listed;</li>   <li>○ What other physical works required as part of odour reduction – stacks on gluten &amp; starch dryer exhausts (stage 3), resize of DDG dryer fans – has this already been done? Decommission ethanol plant cooling towers – what will happen to them – demolish/reuse? How many towers decommissioned? Decommission starch kestner dryer exhaust – what will happen to redundant equipment? All physical works required for Stages 1-3 should be included in the summary of proposal as consent is sought for all of them, however we understand that there will be triggers between each stage to determine when/whether each stage of odour control will be implemented;</li>   <li>○ Figure 2 – what is the proposed MCC room? This should be in Table 2?</li>   <li>○ Table 2 does not include Fire System – tanks, volume, height, water storage?</li>   <li>○ Figure 3 –need a better reproduction so notes can be read. Need to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– labels showing which is anaerobic and aerobic pond;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The co-generation plant and gas-fired boiler have been included in Table 3.</p> <p>Table 3 has been modified to include further details about the Waste Water Treatment Plant.</p> <p>Table 4 has been included detailing the proposed odour control works associated with the development. The decommissioning of the cooling towers and starch kestner dryer exhaust has already occurred. Table 7 provides more details in connection with the odour control works and their associated staging.</p> <p>Table 3 has been modified to provide details concerning the MCC room.</p> <p>Table 3 has been modified to provide details concerning the fire system.</p> <p><b>Figure 4</b> is provided as an A1 sheet to enable clearer reading.</p> <p><b>Figure 4</b> details the components associated with the Waste Water Treatment Plant.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– any pipework that goes back to the plant;</li>   <li>– holding buffer pond and initial receival buffer tank.</li>   <li>• Figure 4 – need a better reproduction and reprint to scale. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What does yellow hatching represent?</li> <li>○ Labels are illegible.</li> <li>○ What is the 30m pink line – is it a Council height restriction? IREP has an 11m height control.</li> <li>○ Do the boxes correspond to separate parts of the plant, i.e. DDG, Ethanol Plant, grain plant, if so, label them.</li>   <li>○ Doesn't show 25m stack for biological treatment system on DDG plant and any other increased stack heights required as part of odour reduction, i.e. gluten and starch dryer exhausts.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• Figure 5 – need better reproduction.</li>   <li>• Section 5.7 – additional cooling towers – how many, additional molecular sieves and assoc additional cooling towers – how many?</li>   <li>• Section 5.8 – pg 34 – pellet plant – pellet mill to be housed in an extension to an existing structure – which structure?</li>   <li>• Section 5.8 – pg 35 – why won't pipelines be buried?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Figures 3 and 4</b> detail pipework between the Waste Water Treatment Plant and the factory site.</p> <p><b>Figure 4</b> details location of buffer tank.</p> <p><b>Figure 5</b> is provided at A1 scale.</p> <p>Yellow hatching removed.</p> <p>Labels improved.</p> <p>Pink line removed.</p> <p>Elevation details show proposed plant in relation to respective parts of factory site.</p> <p>Figure modified to identify odour control measures and stacks.</p> <p>Improved <b>Figure 6</b> provided.</p> <p>Section 5.7 has been modified to provide details of the number of cooling towers and molecular sieves.</p> <p>Section 5.8 has been modified to identify structure.</p> <p>Section 5.8 has been modified to outline why pipelines are not buried.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 5.8.2 – pg 37 – layout of proposed infrastructure not clear on Figure 3.</li> <li>• Figure 6 – reprint so text is legible. Figure should be labelled – water and wastewater balance</li> <li>• Section 5.9 – need figure showing location of existing rail and proposed extension. Need figure showing concept design of pedestrian overbridge, incorporating Council and RTA input.</li> <li>• Pg 42 – old packing plant to be relocated – what will happen to old building?</li> <li>• Section 5.10. Can't compare any of the figures as no consistent measurement used. Current site electricity as MVA – spell out abbreviations in full. This can be provided as a MW/hr or KWh/a measurement. Refers to further info provided in 5.10 – reference is incorrect.</li> <li>• Section 5.10 – treatment of raw water at Australian Paper Mill – be clear as to whether this is part of the project, or separate work. Does SS have consent for works on land owned by Aust Paper Mill?</li> <li>• Section 6.0 – no major issues, however section is a lengthy reproduction of legislation. Would be helpful to show SEPP 14 wetland on a figure in relation to proposed works. Need to be clear that irrigation works would have no impact on the wetland.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Figures 3 and 4</b> outline location of infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Figure 7</b> has been reprinted in a more legible form and labelled with water and waste water balance.</p> <p><b>Figure 3</b> shows location of existing rail and proposed rail siding. <b>Figure 3</b> also shows location of overhead bridge. <b>Figure 27</b> shows concept access designs and including integration with pedestrian overbridge and bridge crossing of Abernethy's Creek.</p> <p>Section 5.9 outlines use of old packing plant.</p> <p>Section 5.10 has been modified to enable comparison between existing and proposed energy use.</p> <p>Section 5.10 has been modified to clarify issue concerning water from the Australian Paper Mill.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6.5 – unsure railway spur line can be defined as rural industry, however, rail sidings may be permissible under Model Provisions; Far eastern portion of site – describing ethanol plant as a waste treatment process is tenuous, rather go with rural industry; Area west of Abernethy’s Creek – state whether cogen plant will be located outside of the riparian zone and zone 7(F3) environmental protection. Should be located outside of core riparian zone.</li> <li>• Figure 7 – need to make clearer and not use two yellow colours to show different things, they are indistinguishable.</li> <li>• Section 6.6 – no assessment of parking requirements against DCP in EA or technical appendix.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 6.5 has been modified to detail implications of Model Provisions in terms of the rail spur line.</p> <p><b>Figure 9</b> has been modified to provide clearer definition between colours.</p> <p>Section 6.6 has been modified to provide assessment of proposal in relation to Council’s car parking code.</p>	
<p><b><u>Odour</u></b> Main EA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further analysis of GHD text or commitments made. Need to be clear on:</li> <li>• What SS is committing to in terms of odour control measures? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will all Stage 1 controls be implemented prior to ethanol expansion works;</li> <li>○ How long will Stage 1 controls take to be implemented?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.1.4 has been expanded to provide a summary of the Air Quality (odour) Assessment and including commitments.</p> <p>Section 7.1.2 of the EA outlines staging and implementation of odour control works.</p> <p>Section 7.1.2 of the EA details the timing of odour control works and staging.</p>	

<b>D of P</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What physical infrastructure is required for Stage 1 control works – these need to be included in Table 2 (Section 5.4) summary of proposal;</li> <li>○ Need a table summarising all Stage 1,2 and 3 works, shouldn't have to refer to the appendix for this information, it should be clear in the main EA;</li> <li>○ What plans would be developed to ensure routine housekeeping/ductwork cleaning, what procedures developed, responsibility assigned, etc. Will they be checked monthly, cleaned quarterly, etc? This should be included in the Statement of Commitments (SOC);</li> <li>○ What odour verification is proposed? Testing, complaints management. On what basis will decision be made to progress to Stage 2 and/or Stage 3 controls? What will be the trigger? OU measurements, no. of complaints?</li> </ul>	<p>Table 4 provides a summary of odour control works associated with the existing and proposed development. Table 7 outlines the works associated with odour control and their staging.</p> <p>Table 7 outlines the works associated with odour control and their staging.</p> <p>Section 8.3.7 in the Statement of Commitments has been modified to outline the procedures and protocols to ensure housekeeping and ductwork cleaning.</p> <p>Section 7.1.2 details odour management controls verification and triggers associated with the staging of odour controls. These included in Section 8.3.7 in the Statement of Commitments.</p>	
<p><b><u>Wastewater Treatment</u></b></p> <p>Main EA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7.3.1, pg 126 – indicates that washdown water and condensates are acidified and stored in a covered pond to prevent odour release – is this correct? I thought only Pond 4 was covered, and condensates were directed to Ponds 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6;</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.3.1 modified.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 7.3.2, pg 127 – what are current levels of COD, BOD, TSS, TN and TP?</li> <li>Please include picture or preliminary design figure indicating what WWTP components look like, include MBR, BVF, SO basin, RO plant, activated carbon treatment;</li> <li>SOC should include routine micro-biological testing of treated water referred to on pg 130. Frequency, analytes, etc? Also testing of pesticide residues/toxic metal ions passing through WWTP.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.3.2 has been clarified in terms of existing levels.</p> <p><b>Figures 18, 19 and 20</b> with associated photos have been included in this section.</p> <p>Section 8.3.10 in the Statement of Commitments outlines the need for routine testing of treated water.</p>	
<p><b><u>Effluent Irrigation and Storage</u></b></p> <p><i>Main EA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No summary provided of technical appendix and no analysis/conclusion.</li> <li>Pg 154 – need to be clear about which scenario forms part of the project. i.e. 100% retentate irrigated, hence Scenario 1 measures will be implemented – include in SOC. This section does not make clear whether one or all scenarios will be used.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.4.8 has been expanded to provide a summary and conclusion of the findings of this section of the EA.</p> <p>Sections 7.3.2, 7.4.4 and 7.4.8 clarify that 100% of the retentate is to be irrigated. Section 8.3.10 also clarifies that 100% of retentate is to be irrigated and outlines relevant commitments.</p>	
<p><b><u>Traffic</u></b></p> <p><i>Main EA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments on technical appendix below.</li> <li>Figure 20 is a poor reproduction – quality should be improved;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Figure 26</b> modified.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7.7.10 Parking – no analysis against DCP requirement as mentioned in Section 6.6. Also, additional parking areas to offset temporary demand by contractors should be shown on a plan – an additional 70 spaces would be required. Does not adequately demonstrate that construction parking requirements can be met;</li>   <li>• SOC – 1st bullet – Need to mention integrated design of intersection to include upgrade of pedestrian footbridge, provision of overbridge and access to packaging plant. 1st and 2nd bullet – need to complete prior to commencement of construction (see notes below on access points 2 and 3).</li> </ul>	<p>Section 6.6 provides assessment of proposal in terms of Council's Car Parking Code. <b>Figure 28</b> outlines car parking on site. Section 7.7.10 has been modified to reflect the parking provision as outlines on <b>Figure 28</b> and including additional permanent and contractor parking.</p> <p>Section 8.3.5 of the Statement of Commitments has been modified to refer to need to integrate access point 2 upgrade, with bridges.</p>	
<p><b><u>Noise</u></b> Main EA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments on technical appendix below.</li> <li>• A clear summary should be provided, rather than a copy of the text in the Appendix. Also a summary of mitigation controls to be implemented would be beneficial.</li>   <li>• SOC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mentions vibration throughout, however this has not been assessed in EA;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.6 has been modified to enable clearer understanding and a summary of the findings of this section of the EA is included in Section 7.6.4.</p> <p>Reference to vibration deleted.</p>	

<b><i>D of P</i></b>	<b><i>Issues</i></b>	<b><i>Section Addressed</i></b>	<b><i>Annexure Addressed</i></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Says noise and vibration would be similar to existing background levels associated with existing plant – this doesn't seem correct. With mitigation maybe levels can be brought in line with existing plant, but not background? Please clarify.</li>   <li>○ Says construction noise monitoring would be undertaken to monitor compliance with noise limits in EPL – however there are no construction noise limits in EPL, they are only operational. Will construction noise be measured against operational limits?</li>   <li>○ States that the potential effects of operational noise have been addressed in design and are outside the scope of this assessment – this seems to me to be the whole purpose of the noise assessment – I don't understand this point;</li>   <li>• Table 37 – 1<sup>st</sup> point – all commitments made in EA – there aren't any for construction. The specific measures for operation should be included as they are critical for ensuring noise compliance, i.e. enclosures, Rw values, night-time fan speeds;</li>   <li>○ 3rd point – assessment indicates construction won't comply with these criteria;</li> </ul>	<p>Statement of Commitments Section 8.3.4 has been modified to detail separate construction and operational noise emission targets consistent with the findings of the Acoustic Assessment.</p> <p>Section 8.3.4 in the Statement of Commitments has been modified to address construction noise limits as detailed in the Acoustic Assessment.</p> <p>Section 8.3.4 in the Statement of Commitments has been modified to detail specific operational noise emission targets and associated noise control measures.</p> <p>Section 8.3.4 in the Statement of Commitments has been modified to detail specific operational noise emission targets and associated noise control measures.</p> <p>Section 7.6 has been modified to clarify issue concerning construction noise.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Last point – as per comments above – will construction noise be measured against operational limits?</li> </ul>	<p>Section 8.3.4 in the Statement of Commitments has been modified to detail construction noise emission targets.</p>	
	<p><b><u>Greenhouse Gas</u></b></p> <p><i>Main EA &amp; SOC</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary is clear.</li> <li>• Table 8 – Can you also include headings in table indicating ‘existing plant’, ‘total (existing + upgrade)’ and ‘upgrade component’.</li> <li>• Total gross emissions – can you include total (existing + upgrade) as a % of NSW emissions;</li> <li>• Table 10 – explain how total credits are calculated.</li> <li>• No SOC for greenhouse, is there any long-term intention to replace coal fired boiler with natural gas boiler?</li> </ul>	<p>Table 12 has been modified.</p> <p>Section 7.2.2 has been modified to include total (existing + upgrade) as a percentage of NSW emissions.</p> <p>The emissions and credits are calculated in Table 13 in the EA. Total credits are also explained in this section of the EA.</p> <p>Section 8.3.8 has been included in the Statement of Commitments detailing Shoalhaven Starches commitments to greenhouse gas emission reduction.</p>	<p>The emissions and credits are calculated and given in Table 5 in Section 4.2 of <b>Annexure N</b> (Appendix B of <b>Annexure N</b> provides greater detail on the components that make up each category).</p>

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
<b><u>Riparian Assessment</u></b> <i>Main EA and SOC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make clear what recommendations will be undertaken as part of the project.</li> </ul>	Section 8.3.13 has been modified to clarify commitments by Shoalhaven Starches in terms of riparian management.	
<b><u>Waste</u></b> <i>Main EA &amp; SOC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 7.11.3.1 – will recommendations be implemented as part of the project? (i.e. waste management database and waste tracking agreements with disposal contractors.</li> </ul>	Section 7.11.3.1 has been modified to clarify that Shoalhaven Starches commits to implementing these recommendations and these have been spelt out in Section 8.3.9 in the Statement of Commitments.	
<b><u>Flora and Fauna</u></b> <i>Main EA &amp; SOC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What recommendations will be implemented as part of the project?</li> </ul>	Section 8.3.19 outlines Shoalhaven Starches' commitments to implementing the recommendations of the Flora & Fauna Assessment.	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<p><b><u>Water and Soils</u></b></p> <p><i>Main EA &amp; SOC</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete water quality impacts heading – the text does not cover it.</li> <li>• Section 7.5.2.1 – show zones on a site plan;</li> <li>• Refers to Section 7.5.2 as containing construction environmental management measures, however these are not included in this section. Add in or refer to SOC;</li> <li>• Section 7.5.2.3 – should make a firm commitment to investigation of bunding on old plant areas and implement.</li> </ul>	<p>Water quality heading deleted.</p> <p>Section 7.5.2 has been modified to reference Statement of Commitments.</p> <p>Section 7.5.2.3 states that Shoalhaven Starches will commit to undertake a review of the factory site to identify and analyse areas of the factory site where bunding of storage vessels and areas is not provided. Based upon this “gaps” analysis an implementation strategy can be formulated which seeks to instigate bunding where it is necessary throughout the factory site. Such a strategy could be formalised in consultation with DECC and incorporated into a Pollution Reduction Program under the Company’s Environmental Protection Licence. This is included in Section 8.3.3 in the Statement of Commitments.</p>	

<i>D of P</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a stormwater design been developed for packing plant area? Should be included.</li> </ul>	Section 8.3.3 details Shoalhaven Starches' commitments to preparing relevant stormwater design for the development.	
<b><u>Contamination</u></b> <i>Main EA &amp; SOC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not make clear which recommendations will be implemented.</li> <li>Some elements are not adequately explained, such as reference to abbreviations - full text is not provided, there is no introduction to the assessment. I.e. pg 167 refers to site 2 on the map – don't know where this is, no map included. Pipe routes 1 to 3, no figure included, and no introduction to where these routes are. Also not indicated which route has been chosen. Abbreviations used in ASS assessment are not spelt out. The main EA should summarise key points and identify which recommendations will be implemented as part of the project.</li> <li>SOC – ASS – will further assessment be carried out to increase confidence in lateral and vertical extent of ASS?</li> <li>Contamination – asbestos – which will be implemented – removal of contaminated soil or encapsulation. Need to be clear what is proposed and exclude the other option, or explain why preferred option has not been determined.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.5.4 has been modified to detail which recommendations Shoalhaven Starches commit to and these have been spelt out in Section 8.3.18.</p> <p>Section 7.5.4 has been modified to explain abbreviations and to clarify references to map to figures. Section 7.5.3 and 7.5.4 have been modified to include summaries of recommendations and commitments to actions.</p> <p>Section 8.3.18 outlines Shoalhaven Starches' commitments in terms of further Acid Sulfate Soil management.</p> <p>Section 8.3.18 has been modified to detail the approach with respect to asbestos management.</p>	

<b>D of P</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will SS contact Coffey in event of odorous, stained soils encountered – how will this be managed – via a contamination management plan/remedial action plan? How will groundwater testing be managed? Need to explain how the recommendations will be put into action.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 8.3.18 has been modified to detail measures in terms of contamination management and groundwater testing.</p>	
	<p><b><u>Aboriginal Heritage</u></b> Main EA &amp; SOC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make clear what recommendations will be implemented, <u>ie.</u> measures in general environmental management plan.</li> <li>Not sure there is any need to repeat full details of all other mitigation and management strategies.</li> </ul>	<p>Sections 7.14.1 and 8.3.20 have been modified to clarify Shoalhaven Starches' commitments in terms of the recommendations of the Aboriginal Archaeology Assessment.</p> <p>This section has been retained.</p>	
	<p><b><u>Visual</u></b> Main EA &amp; SOC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make clear what recommendations will be implemented, <u>ie.</u> landscaping plan and re-design of pedestrian/product overbridge over Bolong Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Sections 7.1.2 and 8.3.17 have been modified to clarify Shoalhaven Starches' commitments in terms of minimising the visual impact of the development.</p>	

## DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT & CONSERVATION

<i>DECC</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
<b>1. Air Impact Assessment</b>	<p>a) The Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) at Chapter 7.1 and Chapter 8 does not clearly state what odour control measures will be implemented at each stage of the development. This should be stated in a form that can be easily understood by any interested member of the public in a stand along format.</p>	<p>Sections 7.1 and 8.3.6 have been modified to include a summary of the proposed odour control measures and their staging.</p>	
<b>2. Noise Impact Assessment</b>	<p>a) The assessment in the NIA has not addressed the Director General's Requirements.</p> <p>b) However, it is recognised that the site is an existing site and has existing Licence noise limits. The predicted operational "project contribution" noise levels (i.e. the level of noise from the project alone, without noise from the existing facility) in the NIA are based on achieving a level that is 15 dB(A) below the Licence limits, which should result in an overall increase in site noise levels of less than 0.5 dB(A).</p> <p>c) The predicted "project contribution" operational noise levels in the NIA assume that noise mitigation works are applied to various items of plant and equipment associated with the proposed upgrade, DECC notes that the mitigation works described in the NIA are largely conceptual and not the subject of detailed design. The Statement of Commitments however assumes that operational noise levels associated with the upgrade are addressed in the design of the facility, and does not provide commitment to achieve the predicted noise levels. The Statement of Commitments in the exhibited EA must specifically provide commitment that the proposed upgrade will be designed and built to ensure that overall site noise levels do not exceed the Licence noise limits.</p>	<p>Section 7.6 includes reference to original noise audit of existing plant and this now forms <b>Annexure Q(ii)</b>.</p> <p>Sections 7.6 and 8.3.4 detail both construction and operational noise emission targets for the project.</p> <p>Section 8.3.4 in the Statement of Commitments details the noise emission targets for the project and outlines the proposed measures to achieve these targets.</p>	<b>Annexure Q(ii)</b>

DECC	Issues	Section Addressed	Annexure Addressed
	<p>d) It is not apparent whether the works associated with the proposed upgrade provide scope to reduce overall site noise emissions. The exhibited EA should identify opportunities to reduce overall site noise emissions through feasible and reasonable mitigation works associated with integration of proposed upgrade plant and existing plant.</p>	<p>The noise audit (<b>Annexure Q(i)</b>) and the Acoustic Assessment (<b>Annexure Q(ii)</b>) detail how the proposal will comply with the noise limits based on the Company's EPL.</p>	<p><b>Annexures Q(i) and Q(ii)</b></p>
	<p><b>3. Irrigation Management</b></p> <p>The current report does not address a number of issues that will need to be dealt with during the planning process, including:</p> <p>a) In using the TDS load of the waste water and the corresponding observed EC values for the paddocks during the 1995-2007 period, a linear relationship has been derived between the two variables to provide a predictor of EC in response to the proposed waste water application. No explanation is provided as to how this relationship was derived and therefore its reliability as a predictor;</p> <p>b) The mass balance of pollutants, particularly the potential movement of salts, nutrients and contaminants to groundwater;</p> <p>c) In the context of the crop, factors such as salt tolerance and specific ion tolerance necessary to meet assumptions in the scheme design. Certain constituents in the soil or effluent may be at concentrations high enough to cause crop damage and reduce yield. In this scenario, the assumptions on crop yield upon which the proposal is based would not be met.</p> <p>d) Any steps necessary to modify or amend the current soil and crop system to ensure the proposal can be carried out;</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in Section 7.4 of the EA and including Section 8.3.10 of the Statement of Commitments.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.1 of <b>Annexure O(i)</b> has been expanded to explain how the relationship is derived.</p> <p>Mass balances are detailed in Section 3 of <b>Annexure O(ii)</b>.</p> <p>Section 4.3 (<b>Annexure O(i)</b>) provides discussion on total EC (salt) effect on pasture growth and Section 3 of <b>Annexure O(ii)</b> provides discussion of potential effects on individual analytes.</p> <p>Section 3 of <b>Annexure O(ii)</b> provides discussion on remedial actions (if required).</p>

<b>DECC</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<p>e) Operational planning to ensure that commitments underlying the proposal such as crop type, yield and irrigation techniques (e.g. deficit irrigation) are carried out; and</p> <p>f) A monitoring plan that links to operational management through appropriate ongoing assessment of the scheme for soil and groundwater condition trends and operational response.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in Section 7.4 of the EA and including Section 8.3.10 of the Statement of Commitments.</p>	<p>A summary of operational planning is provided in the second table in <b>Annexure O(ii)</b> and the table provides a link to further detail.</p> <p>The monitoring plan is detailed in Sections 3 and 4 of <b>Annexure O(ii)</b>.</p>
<p><b>4. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</b></p> <p>DECC support the recommendations of the draft Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment report prepared by South East Archaeology P/L (May 2008) provided that:</p>	<p>a) The proponent prepares and implements an Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan as part of the overall Environmental Management Plan for the project. The plan should detail Heritage within the proposed development and should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. outline the management and mitigation measures proposed for those Aboriginal heritage items to be impacted, such as the potential surface collection for previously recorded Aboriginal site APPM Isolated Find 1 (AHIMS #52-5-0288 and #52-5-0289), in consultation with the registered Aboriginal stakeholders and DECC;</li> <li>ii. describe the procedures that would be implemented if any heritage or archaeological sites were discovered during the development;</li> <li>iii. describe a contingency plan and reporting procedure should damage to Aboriginal objects or sites occur at the development; and</li> <li>iv. describe the measures that would be implemented if any Aboriginal skeletal remains are discovered during the project, including further consultation requirements with the registered Aboriginal stakeholders and DECC.</li> </ul> <p>b) As recommended by South East Archaeology P/L any provisions for Aboriginal heritage should be formulated in consultation with registered aboriginal stakeholders.</p> <p>c) A final Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment report should be prepared following the receipt of comments from the registered Aboriginal stakeholders.</p>	<p>Sections 7.14.1 and 8.3.20 detail this recommendation and commitment.</p> <p>Sections 7.14.1 and 8.3.20 detail this recommendation and commitment.</p>	

<i>DECC</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>																																													
	d) Three copies of the final Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment report should be forwarded to the DECC Queanbeyan Office to allow for entry onto the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) report database and updating of the AHIMS Register.	Sections 7.14.1 and 8.3.20 detail this recommendation and commitment																																														
<b>5. Greenhouse Assessment</b>	<p>Since the main purpose of the project is to increase production of ethanol to be used as a fuel for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in NSW, it is important that the greenhouse analysis is accurate and complete.</p> <p>In assessing the greenhouse emissions associated with the project, the proponents should be requested to provide the following additional information in section 7.2 of the report:</p> <p>a) A table similar to the Table A below, which shows the before and after emissions in summary form, should be included.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>Annualised?</i></th> <th><i>Baseline (before project) Emissions</i></th> <th><i>Gross (with project) Emissions</i></th> <th><i>Net Change Emissions</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Construction</td> <td>Y</td> <td>0</td> <td>302</td> <td>302</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Raw material supply</td> <td></td> <td>174335</td> <td>421284</td> <td>246949</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Raw material transport</td> <td></td> <td>9003</td> <td>43122</td> <td>34119</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manufacture</td> <td></td> <td>445969</td> <td>736709</td> <td>290740</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Product transport</td> <td></td> <td>38613</td> <td>61662</td> <td>23049</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Product use</td> <td></td> <td>-96730</td> <td>-461843</td> <td>-365112</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Decommissioning</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> <td>-31</td> <td>-31</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td></td> <td>471190</td> <td>801206</td> <td>230016</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>Annualised?</i>	<i>Baseline (before project) Emissions</i>	<i>Gross (with project) Emissions</i>	<i>Net Change Emissions</i>	Construction	Y	0	302	302	Raw material supply		174335	421284	246949	Raw material transport		9003	43122	34119	Manufacture		445969	736709	290740	Product transport		38613	61662	23049	Product use		-96730	-461843	-365112	Decommissioning	Y		-31	-31	<b>Total</b>		471190	801206	230016	This information is included in Table 13 of the EA.	This information is addressed in Table 5 in Section 4.2 of <b>Annexure N</b> .
	<i>Annualised?</i>	<i>Baseline (before project) Emissions</i>	<i>Gross (with project) Emissions</i>	<i>Net Change Emissions</i>																																												
Construction	Y	0	302	302																																												
Raw material supply		174335	421284	246949																																												
Raw material transport		9003	43122	34119																																												
Manufacture		445969	736709	290740																																												
Product transport		38613	61662	23049																																												
Product use		-96730	-461843	-365112																																												
Decommissioning	Y		-31	-31																																												
<b>Total</b>		471190	801206	230016																																												

<i>DECC</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<p>b) Table 10 (p. 120) – please provide advice on calculation of Total Emissions and Total Credits, and the meaning of those two terms.</p> <p>c) A breakdown of overall emission showing how they have been apportioned to each product, which would assist in indicating the sensitivity of the emissions intensity calculation to the stated assumptions. Ideally, alternative methods for apportioning emissions would be used as a comparison, eg.</p> <p>i. by product price (although it is noted that this data was not available during initial assessment);</p> <p>ii. by breaking down energy use for each stage in the industrial process; and</p> <p>iii. by assuming on-site historical or industry average emissions intensities for the non-ethanol products, with remaining emissions attributed to ethanol production.</p> <p>d) This may require further collection of data but would improve confidence in estimating emissions intensity and assist in assessing the environmental viability of the project. It is central to greenhouse approval of the project that the increased greenhouse emissions of the project will be offset by reduced downstream emissions from transport fuels.</p> <p>e) The Director-General’s Requirements (DGRs) attached to the report include the expectation that emissions intensity will be compared with “best practice”, not just an industry average. This should be addressed in the assessment.</p> <p>f) In section 7.2.2 it would be better to compare Purchasing GreenPower (p123) to Purchasing Offsets (p124) on the basis of \$/t CO<sub>2</sub>-e rather than respectively as percentages of gross or net emission, which are not truly comparable.</p>	<p>The emissions and credits are calculated in Table 13 in the EA.</p> <p>This is addressed in Section 7.2.2 of the EA.</p> <p>Costs are compared in Section 7.2.2 of the EA.</p>	<p>The emissions and credits are calculated and given in Table 5 in Section 4.2 of <b>Annexure N</b> (Appendix B of <b>Annexure N</b> provides greater detail on the components that make up each category).</p> <p>This is addressed in Section 4.2.7 of <b>Annexure N</b>.</p> <p>Costs are compared in Section 5.2.1 of <b>Annexure N</b>.</p>

<i>DECC</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<p>g) It needs to be clearly stated that transportation of raw materials and products are outside of the operational control of the proponent in order for those emissions to be assessed as Scope 3 rather than scope 1 emissions.</p> <p>h) For full accuracy, full fuel cycle emissions from fuel combustion would be broken down into their Scope 1 and Scope 3 components. This does not appear to have been done in the draft report.</p> <p>i) Presenting Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions as baseline, gross and net in Table 9 (p118) would allow full analysis of the effect of the project in each of those areas.</p>	<p>Scope 1, 2 &amp; 3 emissions associated with the baseline, gross and net inventories are now given in Table 13 of the EA.</p>	<p>This is explained in Section 3.5: Emission Scopes. Details of the Scopes of each emission source are given in Appendix B (the emission inventories) of <b>Annexure N</b>.</p> <p>The amended Appendix B of <b>Annexure N</b> emissions inventories now show scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 emissions associated with all emission sources, including fuel combustion on site. Table 6 in Section 4.2.4 of <b>Annexure N</b>: Fuel Combustion now shows the breakdown of petrol combustion emissions, and emissions eliminated by the use of ethanol fuels, in terms of scope 1, scope 2 and Full fuel cycle.</p> <p>Scope 1, 2 &amp; 3 emissions associated with the baseline, gross and net inventories are now given in Table 5 in Section 4.2: Greenhouse Emissions Results (<b>Annexure N</b>).</p>

**SHOALHAVEN CITY COUNCIL**

<b>SCC</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<p><b><u>PUBLIC INTEREST – EMERGENCY PLAN</u></b></p> <p>Whilst a Risk Assessment is contained under Section 7.8 in the Cowman Stoddart Report, there appears to be little by way of proposed strategies to be implemented should an accident actually occur. In this regard, given the nature and scale of the proposed plant upgrade, and the potential risks from flooding, fire or an accident involving chemicals, it is suggested that the requirements associated with an accident management plan, including emergency measures and evacuation strategies, could have been explored in more detail.</p>	<p>Section 7.8 and <b>Annexure F</b> detail the results of a Preliminary Hazard Analysis undertaken by GHD in relation to this project. The PHA has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of SEPP 33 and associated departmental guidelines. In accordance with departmental guidelines the provision of or modification to an emergency plan associated with this site would normally be addressed as a development consent condition.</p>	

SCC	Issues	Section Addressed	Annexure Addressed
	<p><b><u>THREATENED SPECIES – FLORA AND FAUNA – RIPARIAN LANDS</u></b></p> <p><b>Shoalhaven City Council believes targeted surveys for Green &amp; Golden Bell Frog (GGBF) are required on the site before an assessment of impacts can be carried out because:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The species is known to occur in a variety of habitats on the Shoalhaven River floodplain and localities. These habitats include areas that have been highly modified or degraded such as the golf course (now closed) and urban stormwater drains, both on Worrigeer Road, Worrigeer.</li> <li>The NSW Department of Environmental and Climate Change (DECC) describe some GGBF sites, particularly in the Greater Sydney region, as occurring in highly disturbed areas (DECC threatened species profile).</li> <li>GGBF are classified as Endangered (Schedule 1 of the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995) in NSW while at a national level, the species is listed in the Vulnerable (Schedule 1 Part 2 of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999) with the populations known to be in decline (DECC, GGBF threatened species profile).</li> </ul>		<p><b>Annexure E</b> to the EA is a Flora &amp; Fauna Assessment prepared by Kevin Mills &amp; Associates. This assessment addresses the Green &amp; Golden Bell Frog. This assessment concludes the species is not likely to occur on this site and there is no suitable habitat. Shoalhaven Starches propose to undertake further investigations into this matter prior to determination of the application.</p> <p><b>Annexure E</b> to the EA is a Flora &amp; Fauna Assessment prepared by Kevin Mills &amp; Associates. This assessment addresses the Green &amp;</p>

SCC	Issues	Section Addressed	Annexure Addressed
	<p><b>Council recommends the applicant engage a suitably qualified environmental consultant to conduct targeted surveys for GGBF in appropriate conditions before the environmental impact of the proposal is assessed and a conclusion reached.</b> DECC has produced assessment guidelines which contain useful survey techniques and information about habitats.</p>		<p>Golden Bell Frog. This assessment concludes the species is not likely to occur on this site and there is no suitable habitat. Shoalhaven Starches propose to undertake further investigations into this matter prior to determination of the application.</p>
	<p><b><u>RIPARIAN ASSESSMENT</u></b></p> <p>Coffey Environments “recommendations for revegetation and enhancement works to improve bank stability” because “the foreshore of Shoalhaven River will continue to recede regardless of revegetation works; however, additional vegetative cover and deep binding roots will slow the rate of recession. Bank stability of Bomaderry Creek, Abernethy’s Creek and Broughton Creek is expected to improve with vegetation enhancement as fluvial scour is not as severe. <b>Effective weed management will also be necessary to ensure native species can successfully establish. Finally, it is recommended that Manildra develop and implement a Vegetation Management Plan that outlines the strategic objectives and site specific measures.”</b></p> <p><b>The proposal provides an opportunity to ensure much needed riparian zone works are carried out around the Shoalhaven Starches site. It is recommended the recommendations of Coffey Environments be converted into conditions of consent with a contract with a suitably qualified “bush regeneration”/riparian restoration company finalised prior to commencement. The Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) and restoration works should be fully costed with Shoalhaven Starches required to fund the work.</b></p> <p><b>The final riparian restoration area / VMP should be delayed until the outcome of the required targeted Green and Golden Bell Frog surveys and assessment are known in case the species has be considered further on the site.</b></p>	<p>Section 8.3.14 outlines Shoalhaven Starches’ commitment to weed management. Section 8.3.16 outlines Shoalhaven Starches’ commitment to the preparation of a Vegetation Management Plan.</p> <p>Section 8.3.13 outlines Shoalhaven Starches’ commitments to riparian and riverbank stability.</p>	



SCC	Issues	Section Addressed	Annexure Addressed
	<p><b><u>WASTE MANAGEMENT</u></b></p> <p>Table 3.1 lists the Solid Waste Generated on the site. It is also noted that Manildra is working towards ISO 14001 and will have an EMS in place to manage their waste.</p> <p>Currently, organic material and paper and plastic are being taken off site as mixed waste and are going to landfill (See Photo – Attachment ‘A’). It is understood that this material is supposed to be going to a contractor for reuse in organic product. This material is taken to the landfill on a regular basis so there is concern that what may be outlined in writing is not being implemented in practice. Therefore, Council is concerned that measures proposed to be undertaken in the annexure may not be put into practice as part of the WMMP for the ongoing use of the premises.</p> <p>It is therefore requested that tracking information referred to on Page 6 as the Waste Management Database be supplied to Council; to confirm that the waste avoidance, reuse and recovery measures contained in the Waste Report are being undertaken as an operational imperative and are embedded in the waste practices of the company.</p> <p>It is also requested that a copy of Waste Management System (SA-9- 140), referred to in this report also be supplied to Council and any other supporting EMS documentation.</p>	<p>Section 8.3.9 outlines Shoalhaven Starches commitments in terms of waste management.</p> <p>This matter would be suitably handled as conditions of development consent.</p>	
	<p><b><u>STORMWATER QUALITY</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Soil and Water Management Plan SWMP – for MAJOR works (Pre development)</i></b></p> <p>A Soil and Water Management Plan (SWMP) and accompanying specifications for the construction phase of the works, prepared by a suitably qualified/experienced person and based on the Landcom manual - “Soils and Construction, Managing Urban Stormwater, Vol 1 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, March 2004”.</p> <p><b><i>Storm Water Quality Control Measures (Post Development)</i></b></p> <p>Details on measures to be taken to ensure stormwater is clear of debris and pollutants prior to discharge from site so as not to adversely impact on any water body and/or adjoining land. Stormwater quality devices shall be incorporated into the stormwater design.</p>	<p>Section 8.3.3 outlines Shoalhaven Starches commitments in terms of soil and water management. These matters are suitably handled as conditions of development consent.</p> <p>Section 8.3.3 outlines Shoalhaven Starches commitments in terms of soil and water management. These matters are suitably handled as conditions of development consent.</p>	

<b>SCC</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<p><b><u>STRATEGY PLANNING</u></b></p> <p>It is considered preferable that the cumulative impact of this proposal, other recent proposals and any known future proposals for the subject site be submitted to Council and the state government for consideration as a masterplan.</p> <p>Also, in response to the reasons for referral, the “new zoning requirements” as per draft Shoalhaven LEP 2009 are in working draft form only at this stage. It is also likely that a savings clause will be included in draft Shoalhaven LEP 2009, relating to determining applications made under SLEP 1985.</p>	<p><b>Figures 2, 3 and 4</b> provide plan details of the existing, approved and proposed works as a masterplan for development of the subject site.</p> <p>It is noted that the DoP have not issued a S.65 Certificate for this LEP and as a result the draft Shoalhaven LEP 2009 has not been formally exhibited at this stage.</p>	
	<p><b><u>DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS</u></b></p> <p>There is no mention of developer contributions in the Statement of Commitments, but Council would expect contributions to be paid in accordance with the Contributions Plan (CP) in force at the time consent is issued. The current CP will levy for Roads (including the Bomaderry Industrial Bypass), Fire and Plan Administration. It would be expected that that Statement of Commitments would acknowledge commitments under the CP or acknowledge the existence of Council’s policy on VPA’s.</p> <p>As per the application “It is the recommendation of CSC that Shoalhaven Starches commits to be involved in any future consultation with the RTA and Council that examines the use of heavy vehicles throughout the entire area, as it is certainly the case that Shoalhaven Starches is a significant generator of heavy vehicle trips.” This may include roadworks being conditioned in relation to this proposed development or contributions being made in relation proposed roadworks.</p> <p>It should be noted that Council will be preparing a new CP during 2009. It is possible the new CP may be in force when this application is determined.</p>	<p>This matter is suitably handled as conditions of development consent</p>	

SCC	Issues	Section Addressed	Annexure Addressed
	<p><b><u>TRAFFIC ISSUES</u></b></p> <p>Concerns relate to the cumulative impacts of Manildra DA's increasing traffic volumes on Bolong Road, and outstanding conditions of consent relating to upgrading of Manildra's access points on Bolong Road and Hannigans Lane, pedestrian safety, and upgrade of rail level crossing to minimum safe standards.</p> <p>Council's position in relation to outstanding conditions of consent are detailed in the report below.</p> <p>It is our strongest recommendation that Shoalhaven Starches be required to address outstanding conditions of consent <b>prior</b> to commencement of construction of any new works. This is considered essential in the management of construction traffic as well as offsetting adverse cumulative impacts of the proposal.</p> <p>With respect of this latest proposal, the only new requirements recommended are integrated with works required to satisfy outstanding conditions.</p> <p><b><i>Pedestrian Footbridge – Southern Side of Bolong Road (over Abernethy's Creek)</i></b></p> <p>Council agrees that there is outstanding condition for pedestrian footbridge on the southern side of Bolong Road across Abernethy's drain to prevent Shoalhaven Starches staff and contractors from the dangerous practice of walking along the edge of Bolong Road in this area.</p> <p><u>However, Council <b>does not</b> agree that the recently completed pedestrian footbridge satisfies this condition.</u></p>	<p>Section 8.3.5 outlines Shoalhaven Starches commitments in terms of upgrading works to intersections. This includes commitment that works will be undertaken prior to commencement of operation of the Flour Mill project.</p> <p>Sections 7.7.17 and 8.3.5 have been modified to reflect need for upgrading works to Access 2 to be integrated with the overhead bridge and pedestrian bridge crossing of Abernethy's Creek. <b>Figure 27</b> provides a plan of the proposed road upgrade works including detail of this particular access.</p>	

<b>SCC</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<p>Shoalhaven Starches were made aware at the time the work was being undertaken (and were reminded again in our meeting 11th April) that the approval issued by Council for the current structure <b>was interim approval only</b> to satisfy the immediate safety concerns of Workcover NSW, and Council <b>does not</b> accept that the design or location of the structure is appropriate, and currently await a revised design proposal by Shoalhaven Starches to address the outstanding consent condition for a more permanent solution that meets appropriate standards and resolves location and land ownership issues.</p> <p>The design of the pedestrian footbridge facility must be integrated with all other aspects of design in this vicinity (including design of the upgrade of Access point 2, and design of works associated with the packaging plant development to the north of Bolong Road including design of the proposed overhead transfer bridge, design of a pedestrian refuge to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings of Bolong Road which will increase as consequence of the development, and design of proposal for vehicle access from Bolong Road which Council has indicated it would not support in absence of detailed designs being undertaken to demonstrate that the access could be constructed to RTA road design standards)</p> <p><b>Access Point 2 (ie. Central Access)</b></p> <p>Council agrees that there is outstanding condition for right turn lane to be constructed to make safe the central access (access point 2).</p> <p>Contrary to advice by Shoalhaven Starches, Council has no records that a design had previously been approved by Council or RTA.</p> <p>The design referred to is included in the Appendix A of Traffic Impact Assessment by CSC, however the design and details in that drawing are not readable.</p> <p>However, having viewed a copy of the design at our meeting with Shoalhaven Starches staff on 11th April, we note that the design shows the provision of a fully protected right turn lane (or CHR treatment) with guardrail both sides of Bolong Road.</p> <p>Accordingly, Council agrees in principle that the design would satisfy the outstanding condition however, only subject to:</p> <p>a) Bringing the design up to current standards for type C or CHR right turn treatment as per RTA Road Design Guidelines including provision of guardrail on both sides of Bolong Road;</p>	<p><b>Figure 27</b> provides details of the proposed upgrading works to all intersections.</p>	

<b>SCC</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<p>b) Resolution of the pedestrian bridge issues on south side of Bolong Road including construction of a permanent bridge design as part of the intersection upgrade project;</p> <p>c) The design of the right turn lane must be integrated with all other aspects of design in this vicinity (including design of the pedestrian footbridge facility across Abernethy's creek, and design of works associated with the packaging plant development to the north of Bolong Road including design of the proposed overhead transfer bridge, design of a pedestrian refuge to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings of Bolong Road which will increase as consequence of the development, and design of proposal for vehicle access from Bolong Road which Council has indicated it would not support in absence of detailed designs being undertaken to demonstrate that the access could be constructed to RTA road design standards);</p> <p>d) The pedestrian refuge is to be located to the west of Abernethy's drain (ideally located within the painted island area associated with the right turn lane design). Footpath connections are to be provided to link the current Shoalhaven Starches offices and plant to the proposed new packaging and warehouse plant on the north side of Bolong Road. This includes ensuring footpath is constructed along the full frontage of Shoalhaven Starches operations on south side Bolong Road ensuring path connections linking all plant and offices to the pedestrian refuge; and</p> <p>e) Submission of a design to the satisfaction of Council and RTA.</p> <p>With respect to point c) above, Council has previously advised the Department of Planning that in the absence of a master plan showing how all aspects of design (described in c) above) can be addressed in accordance with relevant standards including RTA design guidelines and relevant RTA technical directions, that Council can not provide approval in principle for the proposed vehicle access from Bolong Road, as Council can not be satisfied at this time that the access can be provided to a safe standard in accordance with guidelines.</p> <p>Accordingly, in the absence of master plan showing how all of the projects in the road reserve can be integrated to safe standard, Council advises the Department of Planning that Council's preference is for all vehicle access to / from the new packaging and warehouse plant to be from Railway Street, with footpath connections only to be provided from Bolong Road as discussed above.</p>		



<b>SCC</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<p>Of particular concern is a statement from Shoalhaven Starches that the trains are “escorted” across the Bolong Road crossing. This is only appropriate if undertaken in accordance with an approved traffic management plan (approved by Council and RTA), and if implemented in accordance with an approved plan by a person wearing appropriate PPE and with current RTA accreditation for implementation of traffic control plans.</p> <p>Accordingly, Council is prepared to accept a section 96 application to remove condition of boom gates, and replace with suitable alternative condition, subject to the following being completed prior to making the application:</p> <p>a) The Australian Level Crossing Assessment Model (ALCAM) being run by the NSW Rail Level Crossing Unit to determine the level of risk of the current rail level crossing operations and whether, in the opinion of the NSW Rail Level Crossing Unit, the level of risk requires intervention to address safety issues (in accordance with NSW guidelines). To that extent, the NSW Rail Level Crossing Unit has advised Council that arrangements can be made to run the model following written request from the RTA to Rail Level Crossing Unit.</p> <p>b) The outcome of a) above is known and any follow up safety issues are agreed to by Shoalhaven Starches, The RTA, and Council with the agreed outcomes being reflected in the proposed amendments to the consent conditions, albeit an upgrade to boom gates, or other alternative condition to be provided by Shoalhaven Starches to address safety issues associated with the rail level crossing;</p> <p>c) To address safety of motorists and of Shoalhaven Starches staff working in the road reserve immediately prior to, during, and after rail crossing operations, and to improve safety for motorists, Shoalhaven Starches are to make submission of an approved traffic management plan, including traffic control plan prepared by a suitably qualified person, that has been prepared in accordance with Australian Standard AS1742.3 and current RTA Traffic Control at Worksites Manual, to the satisfaction of Council and RTA. The traffic management plan must include requirement for advance warning systems to be upgraded to meet standards for day and night time crossing operations and must include those control aspects noted by Shoalhaven Starches in their letter dated 10th April 2008 ie including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* trains approach the crossing and stop</li> <li>* all aspects of the approved traffic management plan are in place</li> <li>* the crossings lights and bells are then activated</li> </ul>		

SCC	Issues	Section Addressed	Annexure Addressed
	<p>* locomotives sound their horn and are then escorted across the crossing</p> <p>* locomotives proceed only when safe to do so and train speed is at walking pace (ie less than 4km/hr)</p> <p>d) Written confirmation from the Independent Transport Safety and Reliability Regulator (ITSRR) that ITSRR that the outcomes of a), b), and c) above are accepted and will be enforced as part of Shoalhaven Starches safety management system requirement under Rail Safety Act 2002.</p> <p>When the outcomes of a)-d) above are known, Council will be in an informed position to determine whether the existing condition must be retained, or alternatively whether Council can consider an application under Section 96 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act to remove or amend the current condition relating to requirement of Shoalhaven Starches to upgrade the rail level crossing to provide boom gates.</p> <p>All costs associated with developing and implementation of plans including the costs of ensuring advanced warning systems are brought up to current standards for both day and time crossing operations, are at the cost of the applicant.</p> <p><b>Hannigans Lane</b></p> <p>Council agrees that the current state of access points along Hanigans Lane does not address consent conditions requiring provision of safe intersection sight distance. There are safety issues at these access points due to obstruction of sight distance by vegetation.</p> <p>Council agrees with the proposal by Shoalhaven Starches to undertake vegetation removal subject to safe sight distance being provided to/and from the access points in accordance with Australian Standards and a commitment to on-going vegetation maintenance to ensure safe sight distance can be provided at all times from the access points.</p> <p><b>Packaging Plant Access</b></p> <p>As discussed above, in the absence of master plan design showing how the proposed access could be provided to safe standard and to the satisfaction of Council and RTA in conjunction with all other works required in same general vicinity (ie pedestrian bridge across Abernethy's Creek, upgrade to right turn lane at Access 2, proposed overhead transfer bridge structure, pedestrian refuge, etc), Council cannot accept, at this time, that the proposed packaging plant access can be accommodated on Bolong Road to safe standard. Accordingly, in the absence of the required information at this time, Council maintains its recommendation that all access to the proposed new development be from Railway Street.</p>	<p>This matter is dealt with in Section 8.3.5 of the Statement of Commitments.</p> <p><b>Figure 27</b> provides details of the proposed upgrading works to all intersections including the Packing Plant.</p>	



<i>SCC</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<p>b) The other issues raised in the Report of the General Manager – Development &amp; Environmental Services being addressed by Shoalhaven Starches following further discussions with Council.</p> <p>A full copy of the General Manager’s Report was forwarded to Shoalhaven Starches, however, the following is an outline of the main issues raised in relation to the proposal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to approval by Council (as the roads authority) for all works required to be undertaken in Bolong Road reserve, Bolong Road is a ‘classified’ road and the approval of the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) for all works in the road reserve will be required prior to construction.</li> <li>• Occupancy of the air space over Bolong Road will require certain matters to be addressed such as, how the tenancy of the airspace is to be held (license agreement or purchase), maintenance responsibilities, regular inspection/certification of structural integrity, insurance and simple matters including rainwater collection and drainage without affecting motorists.</li> <li>• Potential adverse visual impact and whether a more modern and improved design is warranted for one of the main tourist entrances to the Nowra/Bomaderry urban area. With appropriate architectural design, the structure could possibly become a positive visual element or feature.</li> <li>• Potential hazards from an overhead structure above the roadway. This would require Council and the RTA to be satisfied that the support columns of the OTBS are appropriately protected and the supports are located on Manildra land and no non-frangible structures are located within the “clear zone” requirements for Bolong Road without protection to safe standards. (note in accordance with current standards the clear zone requirements could be in the order of some 6-7m when considering 85%ile operational speeds in the area and current traffic volumes)</li> <li>• Height and clearance – as the minimum height clearance to the road pavement is proposed to be 7 metres, there should not be any problems with the bridge acting as an obstruction to public road usage. However, the final determinate of this issue will be the RTA. The overall height of the OTBS is proposed to be 11.6 metres.</li> </ul>	<p>These matters are suitably handled as conditions of consent.</p>	

<i>SCC</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Section Addressed</i>	<i>Annexure Addressed</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of the proposed new access road intersection with Bolong Road and in particular, the alignment of the left turn slip lane creates the potential for conflict with the northern support for the OTBS and location of right turn bay for access point 2 and pedestrian refuge (to provide safe pedestrian crossing of Bolong Road to access the new development). Refer other comments above about the need for integrated detailed design to be submitted addressing all aspects of design in this vicinity, and note Council has to date received insufficient information to be able to comment whether the proposed access can be constructed to safe standards, when considering other requirements for construction in this area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Car Parking</b></p> <p>Council is not satisfied with the response by Shoalhaven Starches in relation to car parking.</p> <p>There are continued instances where Shoalhaven Starches staff and/or contractors are parking illegally in the road reserve and this compromises the safety of those staff / contractors and of motorists driving through the area.</p> <p>Shoalhaven Starches have responded in relation to the issue of car parking, stating that car park supply on site is in excess of the required car parking for the development. However, there is no detailed plan showing how that was determined, where those car parking spaces are located on site, and demonstrating that those spaces have actually been provided <b><u>in accordance with standards</u></b>.</p> <p>Council would expect that Council's DCP18 (car parking code) be complied with respect of all parking requirements on site, and that the total parking demand generated by the development as a whole be provided all on site in accordance with Council's DCP18. This includes sealing and marking of all spaces in accordance with DCP18.</p>	<p>Car Parking issues are addressed in Section 7.7.16 of the EA. <b>Figure 28</b> provides an outline of parking associated with this development - including temporary parking for construction overflow parking.</p> <p>Issues pertaining to DCP No. 18 are addressed in Section 6.6 of the EA.</p>	

<b>SCC</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Section Addressed</b>	<b>Annexure Addressed</b>
	<p>Once this is demonstrated, it is accepted that any additional parking (ie. in excess of the minimum parking requirements) can be provided as informal (overflow) parking areas. However, these areas need to be controlled to ensure safety of motorists and pedestrians is not compromised by informal parking activity.</p> <p>The fact that there are continued instances where Shoalhaven Starches staff and/or contractors are parking illegally in the road reserve indicates that parking is still an outstanding issue.</p> <p>In addition to day to day operations of the site, the impact of construction staff parking is a significant issue and this has always exacerbated the parking problems in Bolong Road for most previous construction activities on site.</p> <p>Condition of consent must include submission of a detailed construction management plan which addresses vehicle movements including heavy vehicle movements, car parking and pedestrian safety, to the satisfaction of both Council and RTA. This may include the submission of a traffic control plan for approval to ensure the safety of workers and the travelling public past the site. Refer below for requirements of traffic management plans.</p> <p><b>Submission of Design for Council Approval</b></p> <p>Conditions of consent must include submission of a design addressing all of the above issues, to the satisfaction of both Council and RTA.</p> <p>It is recommended that a condition would include requirement for statement of commitments and for <i>the statement of commitments to be modified to require the above issues to be addressed and that that detailed engineering drawings and specifications be submitted to Council and RTA for approval prior to the commencement of works.</i></p>	<p>These matters are suitably handled as conditions of consent.</p>	